

Mr. Utley quoted conservative columnist Peggy Noonan, who wrote:

We spend too much on the military, which not only adds to our debt, but guarantees that our weapons will be used.

She quoted one expert, who said:

Policymakers will find uses for them to justify their expense, which will implicate us in crises that are none of our business.

Conservative icon William F. Buckley, shortly before he passed away, came out strongly against the war in Iraq. He wrote:

A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part. A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose but misapplication of pride.

He added that if the war dragged on, as it certainly has:

There has been skepticism about our venture, there will be contempt.

A couple of weeks ago, we saw an Iraq army, which we have trained for years and on which we have spent megabillions, cutting and running at the first sign of a fight. We should not be sending our young men and women to lead and/or fight in any war where the people in that country are not willing to fight for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, fiscal conservatives should be the ones most horrified by and most opposed to the horrendous waste and trillions of dollars we have spent on these very unnecessary wars in the Middle East.

Last week, 19 Republicans voted for a resolution saying that we should bring our troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan. The Republican leadership of the Foreign Affairs Committee did not want any Republicans to speak in favor of that resolution, so Mr. JONES, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. MASSIE requested, and received, time from the Democratic sponsor, Mr. McGOVERN.

I did not want to do that, but I at least wanted to point out today that there has been nothing conservative about our policy of permanent, forever, endless war in the Middle East.

In his most famous speech, President Eisenhower warned us against the military industrial complex. We should not be going to war in wars that are more about money and power and prestige than they are about any serious threat to the United States. I think President Eisenhower would be shocked at how far we have gone down that path that he warned us against.

UPCOMING SUPREME COURT DECISION IN OBERGEFELL V. HODGES, TANCO V. HASLAM, DEBOER V. SNYDER, AND BOURKE V. BESHEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the profound hope that, in its upcoming decision, the Supreme Court will strike down laws that prohibit same-sex couples from marrying and to

ensure that all States recognize lawful marriages performed elsewhere.

These four cases—Obergefell v. Hodges, Tanco v. Haslam, DeBoer v. Snyder, and Bourke v. Beshear—are an opportunity for the Court to end legal discrimination against committed gay and lesbian couples and their children and to reestablish marriage as a civil right, one that is “fundamental to our very existence and survival,” as it was called by Justice Warren in *Loving v. Virginia* in 1967. As a country, we can no longer allow State governments to burden their citizens by refusing to grant marriage licenses based on whom they love.

Since my earliest days in the New York State Assembly, I have fought alongside the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community for equality under the law. I spoke out in opposition when, in 1996, Congress, for the first time, created a Federal definition of marriage with the Defense of Marriage Act, or DOMA, solely for the purpose of excluding gays and lesbians from receiving Federal marriage benefits; and I have long carried legislation to repeal this insidious law, from offering the Respect for Marriage Act to leading the congressional amicus briefs in both Windsor and the current marriage equality cases before the Court. Yet even a full repeal of DOMA would still leave individuals vulnerable to continued State discrimination, which is why there must be a guaranteed right to access to benefits of marriage regardless of where a couple may reside.

When my constituent and friend Edith Windsor began dating Thea Spyer in 1965 and accepted her proposal in 1967, she was not thinking about how the government would view her relationship. She was thinking about the joy and happiness that comes from beginning to shape a life with a partner she loved. Forty years after that proposal, they were able to legally marry in Canada, outside of the country and State they called home.

No one in a free and just country should be forced to leave their home, traveling away from friends and family across State lines, in order to get married. Nor should anyone be faced with the humiliation of being denied government benefits, the tragedy of being barred from a partner's hospital bedside, or the indignity of being refused any of the other thousands of benefits that come with marriage that millions of Americans access every day because a State refuses to recognize their otherwise lawful marriage.

Denying recognition of same-sex relationships signals to the couple, their family, and all others that their bond in love is less deserving of respect, harming the individuals and creating divisions within the fabric of our society.

After Thea's death, Edith bravely fought all the way to the Supreme Court, in the *United States v. Windsor*, to establish what so many of us have

known for decades: that laws that deny recognition of legal same-sex marriages serve no legitimate purpose, stigmatize and shame American families, and are a deprivation of the equal liberty guarantee of the Constitution's Fifth Amendment.

It is time for the long arc of history to continue to bend towards justice and for similarly discriminatory State laws to be struck down once and for all.

Should the Court rule for equality, there will be no losers. No one will be harmed by the granting and recognition of same-sex marriages. Those claiming otherwise are either promoting discredited claims about the dangers of gays and lesbians or falsely believe they have the right to involve themselves in the private affairs of others.

More than 70 percent of Americans already live in jurisdictions that provide for same-sex marriages. It is unconscionable that anyone would propose to continue to deny universal access and recognition, as well as the associated safety and security, to these families.

The Court has the immediate responsibility to expand upon its decision in *Windsor* to ensure that State laws comply with established basic constitutional protections and that all Americans are given the equal respect and support they deserve.

Much as in *Loving v. Virginia*, which also rolled back government-enforced marriage discrimination based on race, outdated prejudices and intolerance cannot be allowed to rule the day. It is time that we make the Constitution's promise of equality a reality for gay and lesbian couples throughout the Nation.

Regardless of the forthcoming decision, we have a long way to go to ensure full equality for LGBT Americans who can still be fired from their jobs, denied housing, and turned away from stores simply for being who they are. We must work together to pass comprehensive nondiscrimination legislation to protect these vulnerable Americans.

SPYING AND SNOOPING BY GOVERNMENT ON AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I store a lot on my computer and on my phone: family photographs, personal calendars, emails, schedules, and even weekend to-do lists, or, as my wife calls them, honey-do lists. But this information stored on a phone like the one I have here is not private from the prying, spying eyes of government.

Most Americans have no idea that Big Brother can snoop on tweets, g-chats, texts, Instagrams, and even emails. Anything that is stored in the cloud is available to be spied on by government, as long as it is older than 180 days.